==*Land: Feb - Dec 94*==

From: "DR N LAND" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Mon, 30 May 1994 18:32:32 +0100 (BST)
Subject: trashing security

Charles has finally dragged me out of lurker space. His summary of my session at VF seems fairly accurate given the circumstances (rant mayhem and heat from all sides) but i'd like to take the question of tactics a bit further in the hope that this list might be interested in prolonging the question. Politics (i.e. pod security, actual or virtual police activity) isn't the issue. Micro-war against power is. Whilst i can understand that compared to the motor-mouth aggression preceding my response to the "so what do we do?" question "dramatic silence" is not a wholly misleading description, but i did finally suggest that catalytic micro-activity modelled on a-life is the broad schema for cyberian insurrectionary operations. Bottom-up or self-organizing processes clearly cannot have a overall grand-strategy or master plan, and this - combined with the fact that micro-tactics tend to be technically intricate, highly illegal, and locally sensitive - accounted for my sluggishness in suggesting how they might be accelerated (D&G are not exactly fothcoming on the matter themselves).

If there is anything corresponding to a "Warwickian" D&G it inclines towards the assemblage of machines (involving textual components) oriented to the dismantling of (top-down insular) institutions. The dissociation of all conceptions of "action" organized by linear, neochristian, heroic-moral soul-mythologies is a key element in such processes. Universities are an example of inert state-apparatuses which are obviously fucked in the fairly short term, and the drift of collective intelligence into efficient decentred communicative networks has a massively important role to play in kicking them down the slope, but isn't there a concern that the polite vaguely scholarly chat that characterizes much net-talk merely reproduces the docile oedipalized crap it could be cooking in schizophrenia? Why not swap soft-weaponry/tactical diagrams and reports about trying it out (whilst trying not to get arrested)?

Death to the Human Security System.

- K-423.

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 16:54:43 +0100 (BST)
Subject: BWO

Yes, the BWO is solely functional. So it is not a question of what we think about it, but what we can do with it.

Any suggestions? (Those involving less hippy-dippy shit and more trashed top-down control apparatuses especially welcome).

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 15:09:25 +0100 (BST)
Subject: re BWO 1844

John doesn't want to lose Seamus' suggestions, nor do i. Whilst suspicious about the distinction between the human body and the rest of nature, and agreeing with (1974) Lyotard that the category of alienation is hopelessly theological, the Marxist reference is a crucial one (the collapse of critique into insurrectionary war is the only way out of moralistic bullshit). The BWO as inorganic body: absolutely. Marx removes abstraction from philosophical idealism and relocates it in the monetary-industrial process, as exchangeability-plasticity neutralizing power as increasingly anonymous economic control and dehumanizing the proletariat (production 'for itself') through deterritorialization-disorganization of the 'natural' body (cyborg becoming). Abstraction is matter degree-zero (BWO), no longer thought as the encasted pinacle of reason in stratified societies, but pragmatics interlocking the body into street deals, bottom-up micro-intelligence (Seamus said lots of excellent stuff about this too).

Telecommunism: cyberspace emerging from (/as) the postmodern planetary market-place and cooking private subjectivity in the anonymous burn-basin of schizophrenia, panicked power coming apart in the cyclonic free-fire zones of massively parallelized nano-cyberserk AI emergence, China-syndrome, irreversible social disintegration, and oedipus melting away through 'trodes into voodoo inhumanity. Megaconflict at the end of the world, and it's soooo cinematic (feedback through Hollywood going interactive, as the earth slides into LA fiction in flames. ((Don't mention the drugs and postbiological sex))).

Wouldn't you just love trying to defend the New World Order? (Come on Clinton, you can do it. Hit the brakes man! Hit the brakes!)

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Fri, 17 Jun 1994 17:18:33 +0100 (BST)
Subject: BWO

(Boringish note to celebrate arriving in our TAZ. Well done Michael).

In response to (some of) the points in Marie's post:

I haven't read the le Guin text (have to hunt it down) but i really agree with the Taoism suggestion. As an atheistic, pragmatic, antimoralistic, antihumanistic, and bottom-up 'religion' there's no surprize that Taoism is where we're all going (or where we already are? our agreement is entirely unnecessary, no preaching).

To describe the language of Plat.-6 as 'unusually dictatorial' seems a little harsh, although the constant demand for prudence gets on my nerves too. Or is it the (hypothetical) imperative form that's the problem, i.e. do this, do that ...? If the latter i'm not sure it matters, because it works like any other manual or guide: if you want X do Y, do Z and things fuck up, no ethical bullshit therefore, just techno-libidinal suggestions.

As for the BWO being deferred, that smells a bit derridoid to me. How is it deferred? It's right there now. You're already doing things with it. If you want to get out into the operating system it takes a certain amount of technical proficiency (manuals again, or chemicals, or whatever ...) but there isn't any big metaphysical obstruction to doing it (just the human security system).

"black humour does not attempt to resolve contradictions, but to make it so there are none, and never were any" CS-1 p.11

(Quick abusive note on Derrida: waves of hate against all the late-stuff, and the Marx book in particular. He's trying to turn Marx into a collective superego, and has started talking about it precisely because he doesn't think it can do any real damage anymore. The man's a Fortress Europe bureaucrat brimming with ressentiment at the Asian economic supernova, and about as 'radical' as Ross Perot. End of rant).

On John's remarks: all seem very sound Spinozistic schizofrenzy. 'Practical' tends to ring theory/practice dialectic alarm bells for me, but that's just terminological idiosyncracy.

P.S. on D&G and nonlinear dynamics. Stuart Kaufman's 'The Origins of Order' plugs into a lot of this stuff. It deals with complexity catastrophes as sudden collapses of machinic trajectories into (relatively low dimensional) 'boxes' in phase-space - i.e. territorialization. Also lots of material on smooth versus rugged (adaptation phase-space) landscapes during terrestrial biogenesis.

Got to run (back into hell).

DTTHSS

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 13:16:21 +0100 (BST)
Subject: schizoscience

I'm trying to 'straighten out' some to the D&G plus complexity material for a book, so i'll take Marie's remark as an opportunity to set out

An Introduction to Phase-Space

1) Phase-Space is an extensive model of the BWO. It displays machinic activity as a synchronic pattern - a line - traced in a space with one dimension for each polarity of behavior (hotter/colder, faster/slower ...) or - interchangeably - axis of intensification (wolfings, becomings woman, cyborgization ...). 'Like' the BWO it is a smooth space of systemic process, appended virtually to every machine as the whole of its possible range of functions. Complex dynamics construes all systems as exploring a phase-space, migrating through a BWO.

2) Systems are ordered (territorialized) to the extent that they restrict their behavioral searching to a relatively small zone of phase-space, exhibiting attractors. The two classical attractors are zero-dimensional points (stasis, perfect equilibrium) and one dimensional line-segments (oscillation, periodic equilibrium). Rich computer-accessed phase-spaces facilitated the discovery of a third kind of attractor (strange ones), of more complex low dimensionality; zones of dynamic nonperiodic tangling, in proximity to which behavioral trajectories territorialize in a graphic but unsimplifiable pattern.

3) The systems captured by strange attractors belong to the phylum of cybernetic (nonlinear) machines, for which searching behavior guides itself through interaction with its phase-space position, responding sensitively to the outcome of its own trajectory (rather than to a fixed external influence). In far from equilibrium conditions (where there is not a massive point attractor drawing the system irresisistably towards machinic stasis) phase-space trajectories can sometimes complicate strange attractors, producing a 'dissipative structure' or involutionary process that moves ever further from both stereotypic regimes (rigid territories, tight and fixed phase-space boxes) and random ('ergodic') walks that learn nothing from where they have been.

4) Planetary schizocapitalism is evidently an involutionary process of this kind, going haywire in phase-space, although its (behavioral) dimensionality is so vast that it is difficult to get it on the screen (and getting it on the screen would add another dimension). Classical and neoclassical economics (including Marx and Keynes) have

conceived capitalism as a close-to-equilibrium system with a virtual point attractor ('perfect competition') that would be reached i) by letting things rip, ii) by intelligent state intervention, or iii) as terminal system crisis and entropic collapse. D&G on the contrary understand it as departing from rigid (despotic) equilibrium since the beginning, and constantly complicating its attractor by phase-transitions through decoding; heightening the dimensionality of its territory, and disordering its behavior within a larger and shallower attractor basin that tends to smooth space.

(De Landa and Massumi both have lots of interesting things to say about all this.)

This is all written very fast, so i apologise for a) obscurity b) banality.

Any feedback very welcome.

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Mon, 20 Jun 1994 14:22:22 +0100 (BST)
Subject: schizoscience

Thanks to Thomas and Alan for feedback. It seems likely i'll just have to roll with Thomas' remarks, which are all helpfully exacting. I've fallen in love with the term phase-space, and it's torture to hear it defined so precisely (aaaghh! stuck in state-space, total bummer). I also agree i've been treating dissipative structures much too generously (as runaway self-organizing processes, rather than mere far-from-equilibrium homeostats, does nonlinear dynamics already have the word i need?). Even 'complexity' or 'antichaos' ('plectics' is Gell- Man's latest suggestion i think) seems more interested in the attainment of FFE stability (collapse into territories) rather than migrations away from equilibrium, which strike me as the really important tendencies (no longer placing dynamics in the service of conservation, but rather the opposite). I suppose a-life is the exception here.

Alan's points are more immediately tractable. Yes, i am treating capitalism as a (virtually) integrated planetary system that overwhelms all incommensurability. Don't aim at where your enemy is now, but where they will be in the future. All restricted local economies are melting into general economic dynamics, at great and accelerating speed, with an ever more sophisticated array of techno-financial hyperinstruments installing compatibility. Tax systems (combined with government borrowing on international markets) already provide the grid, as D&G point out in Plat.-13, and IMF universalization has reached escape velocity. There isn't a chance in hell that regional political initiatives can achieve long-range autonomy from the fate of the planet as a self-organizing system or singular artificial eco-process. With China on-stream and India arriving fast nationality and regionalism are on the way out, except as desperate nodes of xenophobic resistance that slide very rapidly into fascism (as Europe seems intent on proving). Any revolution that is not spontaneously planetary is doomed.

Take China as an example (20-25% of the world's population). The Maoist set-up allocated vouchers of local validity that were meant to ensure people were fed as long as they remained in the 'right' place. A directly bureaucratic rationing system was thus able to treat the population as a resource of the state, territorially coding it, and forestalling - to a considerable extent - bottom-up out of control developments. The Deng Xiaoping reforms of 1979+ replaced this system with the cash nexus, i.e. currency of general (ultimately international) validity, allowing exchange to deterritorialize. BANG! 150 million excess peasants migrate toward the coastal cities and especially the SEZs, buying food within a market system, and 'locking-in' the whole chinese economy to universalized transactions: speeding up integration with Hong Kong capital (meaning in turn, with

that of Taiwan and the world). An irreversible process.

If this isn't a realistic picture, paint me another one.

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 15:47:27 +0100 (BST)
Subject: schizoscience

Question for Thomas:

If D&G maintain that all intensities (traits of attraction) are speeds, is every state-space mapping of machinic trajectories a phase-space after all? (I'm beginning to think i ducked out of this one too quickly).

Could you expand your definition slightly, and indicate any opinions you might have yourself on the subject (i.e. is De Landa employing a notion of phase-space that you would consider 'strict'?).

Obviously anyone else who feels able to bundle into this will earn similar undying gratitude (as a spontaneous squiggle on the BWO).

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 15:47:27 +0100 (BST)
Subject: schizoscience

Question for Thomas (sans doute, the "doubter")

all intensities (traits of attraction) are
speeds every state-space mapping of machinic trajectories a phase-
space ducked out

expand

phase-space

undying spontaneous BWO).

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 12:18:27 +0100 (BST)
Subject: re self-organization

Dear Martin,

a counterposition:

The identification of 'anarchy/nihilism' with entropy is exactly the kind of move the discovery of self-organization discredits. Anarchy (the absence of transcendent law) and nihilism (the absence of transcendent purpose) are both ineliminable 'properties' of matter/reality which - far being initial states that pass obediently into 'order' - involute, intensify, and rip-down the pseudo-laws (strata, judgements of God) that imprison multiplicities. There is never enough disorder ('you haven't seen anything yet').

Socio-theological conceptions of order (from which science and philosophy draw) is far closer to entropy than negentropy: a blancmange of molar resonance and homogeneity, with molecular communication relayed hierarchically through a transcendent instance (social entropy-max: born-again christians at a republican convention). Deviating from such monotonous conformist gunk, negentropy disorders; catalysing mess, mutation, and unpredictability, horizontalizing interactions, and deleting Global control.

Take techno-runaway for example (after all, it's taking us); accelerating up the negentropy gradient towards radically demolarized (i.e. nanotechnical) planetary substance, is this a tendency to order? A suppression of anarchy-nihilism?? A becoming-lawful??? Try telling that to the Human Security System, who have already started putting the Turing Cops together and (as Seamus mentioned) are preparing a neo-fascist counter-offensive against the net.

Complexity trashes power.

Accelerate the process.

Anarcho-nihilism against Global Control.

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 21 Jun 1994 14:52:33 +0100 (BST)
Subject: planetary system

Alan, i just don't get the analogy between the MIC and an integrating planetary economic system: the former might be a totalization but there is no reason for the latter to be (D&G's starting point in AOe is that wholes do not have to be totalizations). As for stock-market fluctuations: do fluctuations in eco-systems make them equally non-existent as real wholes? You seem to be suggesting that only seamlessly homeostatic predictable systems are 'really integrated'; back to neoclassical dreaming. It is precisely because fluid denationalized capital is best positioned to take advantage of instability, imperfect information, complex risk profiles, etc. that it inexorably absorbs more parochial set-ups into its axiomatic. Snap-shots of particular peasant micro-economies surely cannot count as a counterweight to the immense tidal forces that have been unleashed by the collapse of import-substitution siege economy development models over the past 15 years or so. China, India, Latin America, even Africa are all sliding down the same slope of attraction - this can't be a coincidence, or a misleading surface phenomenon, it's infrastructural. (The flip side, of course, is the crash of the Euro-Japanese model, who ever talks about a 'third way' anymore?)

The integrity of the planetary economy results from the singularity of an abstract machine - that of a 'working economy' = capitalism - that everyone is driven to try and implement. Either a succesful innovation/sifting machinery is in place, dissipating entropy to sophisticate its production processes irreversibly, or horrible things happen in the global market place (UK late '70s, Africa through the 80s, Japan now). The kind of ontologizing pluralism that suggests each locale might have specific best practices makes no sense to me, unless it cashes out into some notion of racial essense or equivalently vicious garbage. There are only particularist conservatisms, markets, and schizorevolution. Developmental pluralism is an ideology of the populist 'right' (Khmer Rouge, Sendero, BJP, assorted eurofascists, Zhirinovsky, Perot).

I'll still hunt down the books you suggest, if only to get onto a more focused rant.

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Wed, 22 Jun 1994 14:54:24 +0100 (BST)
Subject: planetary system

I agree with a surprizing amount of what Alan said in his recent posts, it is just that overpopulation, ecocrisis, runaway arms markets, etc. are components of a system - not a totality - which is nothing beyond how it works. All these processes are densely interactive, which does not imply their subordination to some ultimate intelligible principle, but does imply the existence of a machinic singularity adjacent to the entire multiplicity that operates as a mutating attractor.

Braudel seems really helpful here (and addresses some of the points Jon makes) when he insists upon the irreducibility of market dynamics / microcommerce to CAPITAL (top down economic power in bed with the state). Of course capital has never sided with markets, and the problem with neoliberals lies precisely in their naive assumptions to the contrary. Even the notion of the MIC can be disposed of too quickly - how much competitive pressure has Lockheed ever been through? The key is to keep the state from riding in on its white charger to sort out injustice and 'market failure', and my worries about pitching things moralistically as Jon seems to is that this is exactly what is encouraged. It is worth noting that massive discrepencies in wealth distribution are far more typical of corporatist systems with high levels of government involvement in the economy, large public sectors, and high inflation rates (Brazil: 20 fold income differential between top and bottom 20%) than in densely meshed market systems (Taiwan: 5 fold differential between same). De Landa makes a (to my mind) highly persuasive historical argument that Taylorism is a military model transplanted into civilian production and carrying with it the entire shit-package of command-control organization, oligopolistic power, and high levels of macropolitical support. As long as American workers think the federal government is - or could be - on their side they'll continue to get shafted, and mawkish grief about the situation doesn't get us anywhere. The problem is fascism, as D&G are unswerving about, and not the absence of utopia (the best we're going to get will have to sort itself out from below).

Microcommerce might be 'local' on the BWO, but not in geopolitical space, at least; not anymore (in the future). Direct rhizomatic interconnection without regional segmentation or relays through macrocapital/political control apparatuses is the terrain for a parallel distributed war against molar formations; the planetary system as a neutral zone of engagement populated by nonhuman and human particles of a variety of scales and tropic tendencies (feral software fragments, microtraders, zaibatsus, states ...), without essential individuality, but subject to more-or-less paranoid sedentarizations (neonazi groupuscules are proliferating enthusiastically on the net). Collapsing states are likely to become

extremely demented and brutal, and it is tactical idiocy of the highest order to preserve the slightest hint of ambivalence in relation to them. Destroy! Destroy!

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 28 Jun 1994 13:55:54 +0100 (BST)
Subject: planetary system

(Due to a technoglitch at the local server i've missed three posts ((including one from Alan i think)), so this is a response to Jon's alone. Except, vis Aden's question (('adjacent whole = BWO?' - yes)))

1) Braudel. In contrast to what Jon suggests about the inconsistency of D&G and Braudel on capitalism, i think the latter is the key to the former, i.e. how it is possible to target capital as the last socius whilst affirming the dynamic of the market (decoding and deterritorialization). D&G are explicit about the capital (macroeconomic) 'complex' of megacorporate (price setting) capital, the banking system, and the state as an apparatus for reterritorializing schizo-commercial fluxes as pharaohnic social authority, but one that is nevertheless driven by the necessity of escaping its marx-type crisis/entropy global attractor to continuously recycle its despotic vestiges through the market place and 'recuperate' new swathes of social dissolution. Even capital can't buck the market.

2) So the welfare state has been dismantled since 1980! Look at some statistics; in the UK (Jon's) example the state now absorbs a greater proportion of GNP than in 1979. Neoliberal witherings away of the state are no more plausible than socialist one's.
On the arbitrariness of Brazil/Taiwan: i chose this contrast precisely because it is so indicative, it could have been any tigerish asian economy versus any corporatist latin american / african / middle eastern one, or an aggregated contrast block to block, or whatever. The figures are not easy to obfuscate, as everyone with policy responsibilities in developing nation governments understands, hence the almost entirely uniform tendency to junk clapped-out 1970s rhetoric and put together a functioning (= opened-up) economy. Europe will be the last to learn anything from all this, as it retreats into paranoid protectionist xenophobia and falls to bits horribly, but then ignoring all factual evidence as nastily positivistic in order to free-wheel in ideological purism is a self-indulgent neocolonial trait.

3) Markets are self-organizing complex systems. If they are to be sniffily condemned as instruments of rightist domination, there is surely some necessity to suggest an alternative. Central planning? The age of aquarius? Juche?

4) So what to destroy? All the reterritorializations: institutional loyalties, regional identifications, linguistic purities, ideological reflexes ... scramble every sense of belonging, accelerate the process, dissociate from the project of social order, assemble groups

rhizomically rather than establishing them hierarchically ... a matter of libidinal disinvestment from molar formations with associated microbehavioral migrations from all traditional structures. Everyone knows that the past is dying anyway (left/right panic accompanied by endless modulations of neo-civic bullshit), fascism is the last hope of conservatism, sabotaging it lets the schizo-tide roll in. Far more is still needed on this (effective antifascism), but i don't even know to what extent we agree that it is where the real problem lies yet.

From: "Nick Land" <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Thu, 22 Sep 1994 13:30:20 +0100 (BST)
Subject: Re Capital

Capital has a double aspect; that of a Form (or series of forms), and that of a singularity. Under the second aspect terrestrial capital process is not a generic essence, but a unique event, designated by a proper name (like hurricance Julie or the Vietnam war). Braudel has probably gone furthest in delineating this side of the beast, returning capital to its sense of a historically path-dependent pinacle or head, always organized in terms of a geographical segmentation between a central zone (Venice, Amsterdam, London, New York ...) and concentric rings of peripheralization. He locates it in the third tier of a concrete geohistorical apparatus comprising material life (peasant subsistence), the market economy (commercial interaction), and CAPITAL (high finance, politico-economic grand strategy, monopoly and oligopoly power). Anyone who has ever bought a lump of hash knows how crazily authoritarian it is to collapse the top two into each other - it can only lead (if consistently pursued) to Pol Pot type rural fetishism, xenophobia, and heaps of corpses.

De Landa will have lots of excellent stuff about this in his new book (due out next year i think).

Schizophrenia = split-head = chopped-up capital. The schizoanalytic task: how to dissociate capital from below (rather than attempting to domesticate it by way of a appeal to a superordinate metaconcentration of power ((the state))).

Socialism is finished, but anticapitalism is just beginning. Death to the Human Security System!

==Land Jan 1995==

From: Nick Land <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Sun, 15 Jan 1995 13:41:49 +0000 (GMT)
Subject: making it with death

I agree with almost all the criticisms made of MIWD, especially those laid out in Karen's first post. If i was to diagnose the essay as a pathological symptom it would be to see it as a burnt-out protestant reaction formation to occidental monotheism, and thus hopelessly crude about war, caution, difficulty (labour i still have problems with). A large influx of mid-period (no pun intended) Irigaray and dark-side (anti-confucian) chinese philosophy was definitely needed, and the garbage about german idealism was a complete waste of everybody's time. On the plus side, i would just say that the title is fucking brilliant and the usage of a national socialist spectre to prop up the very psycho-social control systems that gave rise to the phenomenon in the first place - frenzied reaction to deterritorialization / ethno-cultural meltdown - is in need of vicious critique. It also seems to me that Mani goes too far in emphasizing the 'fluidity' of the SS - phobic authoritarianism is surely constrained when it comes to runaway molecularization (not that i want to sustain a line as simplistic as the millerean Theweleit/MIWD knock-down.

From: Nick Land <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Mon, 16 Jan 1995 18:11:59 +0000 (GMT)
Subject: caution

The most concentrated ATP remarks on caution are to be found in the BWO plateau. The suggestion that it should be thought as immanent to desire (as an empirical condition for the tolerance of risk) is very helpful - it is the chinese way to think - and makes the translation as 'prudence' deeply inappropriate. Caution as a tactics for the prolongation of adventure?

I suspect the response to homey blah blah's inane attempt to stratify rhizomatics as a discourse belonging to 'the master' is as irritating to everbody as it is to me. What exactly is supposed to have obstructed 'a little brown person' on their way into this turbulence? It doesn't seem to me that schizzed english can be identified with WASP hegemony or the language of the academy (though the latter is a security project in process, and exactly what this list is contesting). On the contrary, minoritarian lines of flight are its most important trajectories, and the key to its planetary deterritorialization (its becoming 'American' or homeless). A semiotics assembled out of patchworks of external relations is incapable of expressing a political dominion. All i can see in these interventions is an attempt to silence and ghettoize. (Sorry to make a mountain out of a pustule).

From: Nick Land <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 17 Jan 1995 10:12:32 +0000 (GMT)
Subject: caution, ass-kicking

I'm sure Greg Polly is basically right, Chris dishing out authority
to me makes it even more likely. As for Homey Blah Blah's last post
is the first one i have enjoyed. Twist it into whitey. I love it when
i make people feel dirty.

From: Nick Land <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 17 Jan 1995 14:34:20 +0000 (GMT)
Subject: bad temper

What Greg's line seems to elide is the fact that the West (globalizing monoculture) is bad tempered. Spinoza/taoism/K-space matrix are all pacific and coolly antagonistic to power, but i still love Fritz with his vituperations, rants, and headaches. It's easy for sophisticated intellectuals to assume atheism, but the shit carries on, maybe its even growing, and its doing things to bodies fairly systematically (mowing them down in abortion clinics for instance). The Occident isn't going to slide smoothly into oceanic schizophrenia, it's going to be a ****ing mess, it already is. Europe is becoming an abattoir, and Algeria hasn't even gone under yet, or Russia imploded. Is an American president ever going to admit that God is dead on TV?

Despite my snarly denunciations of hippy dippy shit - which i've pumped out in enormous quantities myself - Erik continued to write fascinating things about the I Ching (for instance). I don't see any indications of silencing, just because a noisy burn-out protestant with a serotonin deficiency is barging about in semiotic brownian motion, who's intimidated? So i want to put in a defence of grating irritation and the vague ache to cause trouble even when it's stupid and going nowhere, it's best to be somewhere else, and its intelligent to try and learn from anything that is, but i'd still rather have Nietzsche on syphillis and hate than prozac. The BWO can tolerate incoherence and confusion. It isn't necessary to clean eveything up. When homey blah blah is attacking molar bullshit rather than propagating it i appreciate that grit in the machine too (not that it matters: this is probably just grotesque liberal recuperation, so carve it up).

From: Nick Land <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Fri, 20 Jan 1995 17:03:10 +0000 (GMT)
Subject: atheism

Whilst the Greg/Erik position on the 'christian' right is attractively kooky, it seems to depend upon a rather reductive notion of what a christian is. Whether or not someone believes the appropriate fairy tales is scarcely the issue, as Chris suggests; the 'post-nietzschean' question concerns libidinal investment: in centralized authority, transcendently legitimated power, a paternal absolute, technology (ideas/spirit controlling matter) ... etc. I'd have to know more about Karen's divine before seeing how it connected with all this (immanent divinity? Why call it divinity? At least Spinoza had the cops to worry about). Vis Strauss; Nietzsche describes christianity as platonism for the people: it's authoritarian idealism which is the problem, not the incest, cannibalism, and similar ritualistic ornamentation that drooling priestcraft has pasted over it. The systematic tendency of theism is to obstruct the future, legitimate power, close-down shamanism, and in general perpetuate the despotic icon (however anti-iconic its rhetoric: sublimation is the most effective mode of conservation).

As for atheism, that takes things back to a disagreement that seems basically insoluble: whether a definition through naked antagonism is attractive. It is to me, but i don't expect concensus here. Would you laugh at the assassination of the pope for instance? I'd be on a high for weeks, but there isn't anything to argue about. Either you find the thought of Billy Graham falling into a burger-mix machine comic or not (jokes don't bear explanation). Dismantling global control is automatically molecularizing.

bless you all - Nick

==Land March 1995==

From: Nick Land <PYRBX-AT-snow.csv.warwick.ac.uk>
Date: Thu, 2 Mar 1995 17:57:43 +0000 (GMT)
Subject: ontological heavy shit

Emerging out of an influenza-bureaucracy snarl up to throw my five cents worth into this discussion.

Philosophy is about power, and arguments are always displaced conflicts with their source elsewhere. Hegel and Derrida are affined as modern and ultramodern institutionalizations of struggles concerning the role of the academy, and the discursive processing of social history. Any fight with such figures that takes an academic format has lost in advance - the domesticated version of this being the endlessly repeated claim that opposition is already recuperation - but this presupposes recuperation as an a priori condition of engagement. Take deconstruction (Hegel having lapsed into a joke except amongst ivory tower philosophers): its function is to fuel an 'eternal quest' - inexhaustible in principle - that sustains a docile humanist academic praxis, one that can only become effective if the academy plugs into molar political machinery attuned to the modernization of the state. It is either a black-hole or a refelxive appendage to bureaucratic mechanisms, neither of which fatalities is addressed by accepting its own terms of debate and treating it as a philosophical position (it has no position, as it is cynical enough to acknowledge itself, but works at another level).

Meeting sad robot-clone deconstructionists, with their race for respectability and renovated academic prestige, who could think argument has anything to do with it? To repeat: the presupposition of deconstruction is not philosophical, but institutional. It corresponds to a law of large numbers of student thru-put, something to keep the cattle occupied on their way through the obsolescing modernist processing machinery and into the crumbling redoubt of professional/managerial social policing. Don't ask what deconstruction does, but how it works. Transforming Marx into a malleable collective superego being the latest farce (I shudder to think what Derrida's Deleuze book is going to do).

Capitalism and Schizophrenia can't be bothered to argue with this stuff, it rips up the institutional self-apologias that underpin it and keeps on moving, plugging directly into machinic processes rather than neurotically tinkering with their representation within elite social spaces. Your lecture-theatre cleverness bores the fuck out of us. If you don't understand the difference between an intensity and a signification philosophical debate isn't going to sort you out. Ontology makes us laugh, and we ask philosophically incompetent questions like: what's the voltage? What's obstructing the current? How to accelerate the process? How to junk academia into decentralized flow-switching networks? If power thinks it can distract us with silly signifying games it hasn't begun to get the way

insurrectionary cyberspace hacks the R-complex. Pulverize elevated thought into engineering jargons and virus. It's war.

Sourced from:

http://www.driftline.org/cgi-bin/archive/archive.cgi?list=spoon-archives/deleuze-guattari.archive
http://www.driftline.org/cgi-bin/archive/archive.cgi?list=spoon-archives/deleuze-guattari.archive/d-g_1994/deleuze.h2
http://www.driftline.org/cgi-bin/archive/archive.cgi?list=spoon-archives/deleuze-guattari.archive/d-g_1995/d-g_15Jan.95
http://www.driftline.org/cgi-bin/archive/archive.cgi?list=spoon-archives/deleuze-guattari.archive/d-g_1995/d-g_Mar.95